REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The sole claim is claim 4, with claims 2-3 having previously been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as directed to a non-elected invention. Claim 4 has been amended to better define the invention. Support is found, *inter alia*, in FIGS. 1-4. Reconsideration is expressly requested.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Roemer et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,872,248*.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As set forth in claim 4 as amended, Applicant's invention provides a sliding bearing shell including a shell body having a shell body thickness, a shell back portion, a separation area, and at least one holding cam arranged near the separation area and projecting radially from the shell back portion. The at least one holding cam forms a deformation section extending over only a part of the shell body thickness.

The deformation section includes a tongue that is partly cut and bent out from the shell body at an angle forming an

indentation starting from the separation area. The indentation has a width measured from the shell body to a side of the tongue facing the shell body that narrows from the separation area. See, e.g., FIGS. 2 and 4.

In this way, Applicant provides a sliding bearing shell that forms sufficiently dimensioned holding cams simply even in the case of thin-walled slide bearing shells. With Applicant's sliding bearing shell as recited in claim 4, it is possible to provide holding cams projecting sufficiently over the shell back without impairing the bearing surface in the region of the holding cams, even in the case of comparatively thin slliding bearing shells.

In addition, due to the indentation of the sliding bearing shell, the forces required for making the deformation section can be kept at a comparatively low level in comparison with other required upsetting forces. Moreover, the hardening of the material due to cold deformation remains limited so that the likelihood of the formation of cracks especially in the region of the root of the tongue (i.e. in the transitional region from tongue to shell back) remains low, so that the formation of the

deformation section in accordance with Applicant's claim 4 as amended as a partly cut-out tongue impairs the strength properties of the sliding bearing shell in the region of the holding cam only to a comparatively low extent.

Roemer et al. describes a slide bearing shell having a recess 15 that is open toward the outer mantle and delimited axially followed by a projection 13 that projects radially beyond the circumferences as a holding cam as discussed in Applicant's Amendment filed September 25, 2008. In contrast, Applicant's holding cam is formed by a tongue that projects against the parting surface in the circumferential direction in the starting position and then is bent radially out of the shell body.

It is respectfully submitted that a tongue having this structure as can be clearly seen in FIGS. 1 and 4 is manifestly different from radial projection 13 of *Roemer et al.* With Applicant's structure as recited in amended claim 4, a wedge gap that narrows toward the tongue root occurs between the tongue and the shell body that remains in the tongue region because of the bent-out tongue. This gap is a characteristic for the bent-out tongue as recited in amended claim 4.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the holding cam 13 ("radial projection") of *Roemer et al.* cannot be considered a tongue as recited in Applicant's claim 4 as amended. Although a recess 15 is formed in the joint face 12 of the sliding bearing shell of *Roemer et al.* during the upsetting of the radial projection 13, it is respectfully submitted that this recess 15 and radial projection 13 do not constitute a tongue that is partly cut and bent out from the shell body leaving an indentation starting from the separation area. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that *Roemer et al.* fails to anticipate or render obvious Applicant's claim 4 as amended.

Even if the Examiner is correct in considering radial projection 13 of *Roemer et al.* to be a tongue, this radial projection 13 does not extend from the shell body in a way that an indentation is formed that has a width measured from the shell body to a side of the tongue facing the shell body that narrows from the separation area. As seen clearly in FIGS. 1 and 2 of *Roemer et al.*, the indentation that results from the formation of the radial projection 13 in *Roemer et al.* has a rectangular shape that has a constant width and does not narrow. FIG. 1 of *Roemer et al.* shows a 90° angle formed at the junction of the radial

projection 13 and the shell body. FIG. 2 of *Roemer et al.* shows a front view of the rectangular indentation above radial projection 13 that results from the formation of the radial projection 13.

In contrast, Applicant's tongue is bent out at an angle that forms an indentation starting from the separation area, and the indentation has a width, measured from the shell body to a side of the tongue facing the shell body, that narrows from the separation area. In the view of the sliding bearing shell shown in FIG. 2 of Applicant's specification, this width is measured between the left end of the tongue (of which only a top view can be seen) and the portion of the shell body directly to the left of the tongue.

The shell of *Roemer et al.* with a radial projection made through embossing, moreover, can be made only with great difficulty in thin sliding bearing shells. In contrast, Applicant's sliding bearing shell as set forth in claim 4 as amended, with a tongue that is partly cut and bent out from the shell body that forms an indentation that narrows, can be efficiently made for thin or thick bearing shells.

Applicant's sliding bearing shell as set forth in claim 4 as amended, with a tongue that is partly cut and bent out from the shell body that forms an indentation that narrows, can also be made with a lower expenditure of energy than is required for the production of the sliding bearing shells of *Roemer et al.* that are made through embossing.

Applicant's sliding bearing shell as set forth in claim 4 as amended, with a tongue that is partly cut and bent out from the shell body that forms an indentation that narrows, also experiences less cracking of the shell body in the region of the tongue than a sliding bearing shell made according to *Roemer et al.* experiences, because Applicant's tongue is not formed through a change in temperature. The cold deformation that occurs to shells in *Roemer et al.*, that are made by debossing, increases the likelihood of the formation of cracks in the area of the radial projection, and can impair the strength properties of the shells. Applicant's sliding bearing shell as set forth in claim 4 as amended, with a tongue that is partly cut and bent out from the shell body that forms an indentation that narrows, does not have its strength properties impaired due to cracking resulting from cold deformation of the shell body and tongue.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 as amended is patentable over *Roemer et al.* because of structural differences in the claimed subject matter, that are outlined in claim 4 as amended, that result from a safer, more efficient production than that disclosed in *Roemer et al.*

In summary, claim 4 has been amended. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the claim be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
Norbert SCHRÜFER

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802
FJD:CW:djp

Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg. No.29,298
Attorneys for Applicant

EXPRESS MAIL NO. EM 285 933 978 US
Date of Deposit: March 30, 2009

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10, on the date indicated above, and is addressed to Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Amy Klein